

Evaluation of Senior-Level Administrators at Binghamton University

Presentation to University Faculty Senate,
140th Plenary

Peter Knuepfer, Binghamton University

A stylized silhouette of a mountain range in shades of teal, located at the bottom right of the slide.

A Bit of History

- ◆ On October 25, 1994, the Faculty Senate of the State University of New York at Binghamton voted to establish a system for evaluation of the performance of University administrators.
- ◆ The Faculty chose to make reports of these committees confidential and distributed only to the administrator being evaluated, the immediate supervisor of the administrator, and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Provisions

- ◆ Evaluation Coordinating Committee established to oversee process
- ◆ Academic administrators to be evaluated at least once every four years
- ◆ Administrators to be evaluated are those who have significant responsibilities involving them in the academic program, including
 - President; Provost; Deans; Vice Provosts; Associate VP for Computing and Educational Technologies; Director of Libraries; Director of Health, Physical Education, and Athletics; Director of Continuing Education and Outreach

Evaluation Coordinating Committee

- ◆ Nine-member committee of members of the Faculty Senate, chosen by secret ballot from the entire Senate membership.
- ◆ Representative of the academic units: 1 each from the four professional schools, 3 from Arts and Sciences (1 from each division), 1 from libraries, 1 from HEPA
- ◆ 2-year terms

Process

- ◆ Evaluation Coordinating Committee identifies which administrator(s) is/are due for evaluation
- ◆ Committee contacts faculty in relevant school to oversee evaluation of Dean; committee directly oversees evaluation of University-wide administrators
- ◆ ECC inform administrator to be evaluated and request documentation such as a current vita, administrator's job description, and a narrative self-evaluation
- ◆ ECC establishes or guides School faculty in establishing an evaluation instrument, typically a survey sent to appropriate faculty members

Process (continued)

- ◆ ECC compiles reports from relevant academic units and/or results of survey of faculty
- ◆ ECC develops a draft report that includes a summary of the process, a summary of survey results and/or academic unit reports, and a summary of a vote for or against renewal by relevant faculty
- ◆ Report is submitted to administrator being evaluated for comment
- ◆ Final report forwarded to Executive Committee, administrator, and administrator's superior

Some Reflections after a decade

- ◆ Process preserves anonymity and fosters frank evaluation because of confidentiality of reports
- ◆ Reluctance by some units to review deans; reluctance by ECC to review President and Provost in recent years
- ◆ Confidentiality of results means that faculty don't actually know about the performance of their administrators (or at least how that performance is viewed by others).
- ◆ Administration has not always appreciated timing or message from evaluation.